



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,967	02/06/2002	Chris Bollerud	1001996-1	2370

7590 10/18/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2145

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/068,967	BOLLERUD, CHRIS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tanim Hossain	2145	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al (U.S. 2004/0024848), a division of now U.S. Patent 6,578,078, filed on April 2, 1999.

As per claim 1, Smith teaches a computerized content management system comprising: a receiving queue for receiving content (paragraph 0040, 0125); a content staging unit, coupled to the receiving queue, and including an operating system to validate the content for format consistency and verify its accuracy (0069, 0125) and process the content from a first format to a second format defined by the content management system (0069, 0125).

As per claim 2, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 1, wherein the content staging unit, while validating the content, further checks for description file information and provides such description file information, if missing (0078).

As per claim 3, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 2, wherein the content staging unit provides identity of the description file after checking (0078).

As per claim 4, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 1, wherein the content includes a content item having a search hierarchy and the staging unit cleanses the content item to ensure the content item and its search hierarchy are reliably linked (0061).

As per claim 5, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 4, wherein the content staging unit determines the search hierarchy of the content item and assigns the content item to the identified hierarchy (0061).

As per claim 6, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 1, wherein the content staging unit checks whether meta-data associated with the content is consistent with a previously defined format of the system (0125).

As per claim 7, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 1, further comprising a content error zone, coupled to the content staging unit, to receive any content item failing validation (0072).

As per claim 8, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 1, wherein the content staging unit notifies the content provider if the content failed validation (0076).

As per claim 9, Smith teaches the invention according to claim 1, wherein the content staging unit maintains a prior valid version of the content for access by the user should the content fail validation (0040).

As per claim 10, Smith teaches a method of controlling content accessed by an end user within a shared content environment, the method comprising: receiving at least one content item from a content provider (0040, 0125); checking for description file information (0069); backfilling information within the description file if missing (0039); determining if the content item is valid (0036); copying the content item with an associated description file within an

archive (0068); importing the description file to a content holding database (0072); and sending valid content to a holding zone (0072).

As per claim 11, Smith teaches a method of providing error control of content accessed by an end user within a shared content environment, the method comprising: receiving at least one content item from a content provider with the intent of making available the content item to an end user (0040); validating the content item is error-free (0076); making the valid content item available to the content provider for access to the end-user (0069).

As per claim 12, Smith teaches the method according to claim 11, wherein the validating step comprises cleansing the content item to ensure the content item and its search hierarchy are reliably linked (0061).

As per claim 13, Smith teaches the method according to claim 11, wherein the validating step comprises archiving the content item (0067).

As per claim 14, Smith teaches the method according to claim 11, wherein the validating step comprises: determining the hierarchy of the content item (0061); and assigning the content item to the identified hierarchy (0061).

As per claim 15, Smith teaches the method according to claim 11, wherein the validating step comprises checking meta-data associated with the content item is consistent with a previously defined format for the system (0125).

As per claim 16, Smith teaches the method according to claim 11, further comprising moving the content item to an error zone upon lack of validation (0076).

As per claim 17, Smith teaches the method according to claim 11 further comprising notifying the content provider that the content item failed validation (0076).

As per claim 18, Smith teaches the method according to claim 11, further comprising maintaining a prior valid version of the content item for access by the user should the content item fail validation (0040).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed on July 25, 2005 have fully been considered, but are not persuasive.

a. As per claim 1, the reception of content constitutes the reception of any type of entity, including URL metadata, as discussed in paragraph 0125 of Smith. When there exist multiple determinations of broken hyperlinks, a queue of a certain process is constituted. Further, the validation of format consistency and the verification of its accuracy are conducted in the sense that a check takes place, discovering whether the links are broken or not. If they are, the correct and links are repaired (processing from a first format to a second) and kept in a database, which constitutes a storage unit, coupled to the staging unit, including an operating system (which implements the changes) to receive the validated and verified content defined by the system. Therefore the elements of claim 1 are fully taught in Smith.

b. As per claim 10, Smith teaches the site administrator constitutes the provider of the content, and thus is a content provider. Reception, checking, backfilling, and validation are all taught by the same rationale as the discussion in claim 1. The updated links are stored in a database, which holds the content, and the valid, fixed content is kept in a holding zone.

c. As per claim 11, Smith teaches the reception of links, eventually made available to the user, which is verified for its functionality, and then offered to the end-user.

### *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571/272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tanim Hossain  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2145



JASON CARBONE  
SPE AU2145